arXiv:1610.05044v1 [math.MG] 17 Oct 2016

# ISOPERIMETRIC INEQUALITIES FOR FINITE PERIMETER SETS UNDER LOWER RICCI CURVATURE BOUNDS

FABIO CAVALLETTI AND ANDREA MONDINO

Abstract. We prove that the results regarding the Isoperimetric inequality and Cheeger constant formulated in terms of the *Minkowski content*, obtained by the authors in previous papers [14, 15] in the framework of essentially non-branching metric measure spaces verifying the local curvature dimension condition, also hold in the stronger formulation in terms of the *perimeter*.

## 1. Introduction

In the recent paper [14] the authors proved the following sharp isoperimetric inequality:

$$\mathfrak{m}^+(E) \geq \mathcal{I}_{K,N,D}(\mathfrak{m}(E)), \tag{1.1}$$

where $E \subset X$ is any Borel set, $(X, \mathsf{d}, \mathfrak{m})$ is a metric measure space of diameter less than $D$ verifying the local curvature dimension condition with parameters $K$ and $N$, it is moreover essentially non-branching and finally $\mathfrak{m}$ is a probability measure. On the right-hand side of (1.1) there is $\mathcal{I}_{K,N,D}$, the sharp model isoperimetric profile function associated to $K, N, D$, see Section 2.2 for details. On the left hand side, $\mathfrak{m}^+(E)$ denotes the outer Minkowski content of $E$:

$$\mathfrak{m}^+(E) \quad := \quad \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathfrak{m}(E^\varepsilon) - \mathfrak{m}(E)}{\varepsilon}, \tag{1.2}$$

where $E^\varepsilon := \{x \in X \,:\, \mathsf{d}(E, x) \leq \varepsilon\}$. Outer Minkowski content gives a measurement of the size of $\partial E$. It is anyway a less accurate measurement than the one given by the perimeter.

In the Euclidean space sets of finite perimeter are those sets whose characteristic function has finite total variation, in the $BV$-sense. If this is the case, the weak derivative of the characteristic function is a positive finite measure called perimeter measure; the perimeter of the set is the total mass of the perimeter measure. Sets of finite perimeter can also be defined via relaxation in the following equivalent form: given a Borel subset $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $A$ open, the perimeter of $E$ in $A$, $\mathsf{P}(E, A)$, is defined as follows

$$\mathsf{P}(E, A) \quad := \quad \inf \left\{ \liminf_{n \to \infty} \int_A |\nabla u_n| \, dx \,:\, u_n \in \mathrm{Lip}(A),\, u_n \to \chi_E \text{ in } L^1_{loc}(A) \right\}, \tag{1.3}$$

where $\chi_E$ is the characteristic function of $E$; accordingly $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ has finite perimeter in $\mathbb{R}^n$ if and only if $\mathsf{P}(E, \mathbb{R}^n) < \infty$. Here $\mathrm{Lip}(A)$ denotes the space of real valued Lipschitz functions defined over $A$.

Looking at (1.3), one finds out that all the objects used to define $\mathsf{P}(E, A)$ have a clear generalization when we substitute the Euclidian space with any metric space and the Lebesgue measure with any Borel measure. The theory of sets with finite perimeter in metric spaces has been developed in great generality in [1, 2], to which we refer for a deeper insight.

The perimeter function $\mathsf{P}(E, \cdot)$, both in the Euclidean and in the metric framework, enjoys many nice properties: it is the restriction to open sets of a Borel measure having support in the essential boundary of $E$, $\partial^* E$; it is absolutely continuous with respect to the Hausdorff measure of codimension 1 restricted on $\partial^* E$ with density bounded from below and from above; it is used in the coarea formula, etc.. It is therefore more natural to look for inequalities involving $\mathsf{P}(E)$ rather than $\mathfrak{m}^+(E)$. Moreover already from their definition one observes that $\mathsf{P}(E) \leq \mathfrak{m}^+(E)$: indeed in the definition of $\mathfrak{m}^+$ only the uniform approximation of $E$ is considered while in $\mathsf{P}(E)$ any Lipschitz approximation is allowed.

It appears then as a natural question whether or not (1.1) holds true replacing $\mathfrak{m}^+(E)$ with $\mathsf{P}(E)$. The scope of this note is to answer affirmatively to this question: we generalize the results proved in [14] to the perimeter case.

The following is the main result obtained in this note.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let $(X, \mathsf{d}, \mathfrak{m})$ be a metric measure space with $\mathfrak{m}(X) = 1$, verifying the essentially non-branching property and $\mathsf{CD}_{loc}(K, N)$ for some $K \in \mathbb{R}, N \in [1, \infty)$. Let $D$ be the diameter of $X$, possibly assuming the value $\infty$.*

*Then for every Borel subset $E \subset X$, calling $\mathfrak{m}(E) = v \in [0, 1]$, it holds*

$$\mathsf{P}(E) \ \geq \ \mathcal{I}_{K,N,D}(v),$$

*where $\mathcal{I}_{K,N,D}$ is the model isoperimetric profile defined in* (2.10).

The proof of Theorem 1.1 follows the same scheme of the proof of (1.1) contained in [14]. There, the analysis on the one dimensional version of (1.1) permitted to obtain the general (1.1) via a one-dimensional localization argument based on an $L^1$-Optimal Transportation problem (see also [25]). Here again we first prove Theorem 1.1 in the easier one-dimensional framework and then we obtain the general case via localization. The one dimensional analysis is contained in Section 3 while Section 4 contains the proofs of Theorem 1.1, of the Cheeger isoperimetric inequality (Theorem 4.1) and of the corresponding almost rigidity result (Corollary 4.2).

We also include below the statements of rigidity, the almost maximal diameter and the almost rigidity results one can obtain by replacing the outer Minkowski content with the perimeter.

Repeating verbatim the proof of [14, Theorem 1.4] we obtain the rigidity for the perimeter. We set

$$\mathcal{I}_{(X,\mathsf{d},\mathfrak{m})}(v) := \inf\{\mathsf{P}(E) \ : \ E \subset X, \ \mathfrak{m}(E) = v\}.$$

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let $(X, \mathsf{d}, \mathfrak{m})$ be an $\mathsf{RCD}^*(N-1, N)$ space for some $N \in [2, \infty)$, with $\mathfrak{m}(X) = 1$. Assume that there exists $\bar{v} \in (0, 1)$ such that $\mathcal{I}_{(X,\mathsf{d},\mathfrak{m})}(\bar{v}) = \mathcal{I}_{N-1,N,\infty}(\bar{v})$.*

*Then $(X, \mathsf{d}, \mathfrak{m})$ is a spherical suspension: there exists an $\mathsf{RCD}^*(N-2, N-1)$ space $(Y, \mathsf{d}_Y, \mathfrak{m}_Y)$ with $\mathfrak{m}_Y(Y) = 1$ such that $X$ is isomorphic as metric measure space to $[0, \pi] \times_{\sin}^{N-1} Y$.*

*Moreover, in this case, the following hold:*

*i) For every $v \in [0, 1]$ it holds $\mathcal{I}_{(X,\mathsf{d},\mathfrak{m})}(v) = \mathcal{I}_{N-1,N,\infty}(v)$.*

*ii) For every $v \in [0, 1]$ there exists a Borel subset $A \subset X$ with $\mathfrak{m}(A) = v$ such that*

$$\mathsf{P}(A) = \mathcal{I}_{(X,\mathsf{d},\mathfrak{m})}(v) = \mathcal{I}_{N-1,N,\infty}(v).$$

*iii) If $\mathfrak{m}(A) \in (0, 1)$ then $\mathsf{P}(A) = \mathcal{I}_{(X,\mathsf{d},\mathfrak{m})}(v) = \mathcal{I}_{N-1,N,\infty}(v)$ if and only if*

$$\min\Big(\mathfrak{m}(A \setminus \{(t, y) \in [0, \pi] \times_{\sin}^{N-1} Y \ : \ t \in [0, r_v]\}), \mathfrak{m}(A \setminus \{(t, y) \in [0, \pi] \times_{\sin}^{N-1} Y \ : \ t \in [\pi - r_v, \pi]\})\Big) = 0,$$

*where $r_v \in (0, \pi)$ is chosen so that $\int_{[0,r_v]} c_N (\sin(t))^{N-1} dt = v$, $c_N$ being given by $c_N^{-1} := \int_{[0,\pi]} (\sin(t))^{N-1} dt$.*

Repeating verbatim the proof of [14, Theorem 1.5] we get

**Theorem 1.3** (Almost equality in Lévy-Gromov implies almost maximal diameter)**.** *For every $N > 1$, $v \in (0, 1)$, $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\bar{\delta} = \bar{\delta}(N, v, \varepsilon) > 0$ such that the following holds. For every $\delta \in [0, \bar{\delta}]$, if $(X, \mathsf{d}, \mathfrak{m})$ is an $\mathsf{RCD}^*(N - 1 - \delta, N + \delta)$ space satisfying*

$$\mathcal{I}_{(X,\mathsf{d},\mathfrak{m})}(v) \leq \mathcal{I}_{N-1,N,\infty}(v) + \delta,$$

*Then* $\operatorname{diam}((\mathrm{X}, \mathsf{d})) \geq \pi - \varepsilon$.

The following corollary is a consequence of the Maximal Diameter Theorem [24], and of the compactness/stability of the class of $\mathsf{RCD}^*(K, N)$ spaces, for some fixed $K > 0$ and $N > 1$, with respect to the measured Gromov-Hausdorff convergence (for more details see [14, Section 6.4]).

**Corollary 1.4** (Almost equality in Lévy-Gromov implies mGH-closeness to a spherical suspension)**.** *For every $N \in [2, \infty)$, $v \in (0, 1)$, $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\bar{\delta} = \bar{\delta}(N, v, \varepsilon) > 0$ such that the following hold. For every $\delta \in [0, \bar{\delta}]$, if $(X, \mathsf{d}, \mathfrak{m})$ is an $\mathsf{RCD}^*(N - 1 - \delta, N + \delta)$ space satisfying*

$$\mathcal{I}_{(X,\mathsf{d},\mathfrak{m})}(v) \leq \mathcal{I}_{N-1,N,\infty}(v) + \delta,$$

*then there exists an $\mathsf{RCD}^*(N-2, N-1)$ space $(Y, \mathsf{d}_Y, \mathfrak{m}_Y)$ with $\mathfrak{m}_Y(Y) = 1$ such that*

$$\mathsf{d}_{mGH}(X, [0, \pi] \times_{\sin}^{N-1} Y) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Let us finally mention the closely related independent preprint of Ambrosio, Gigli and Di Marino [4], where it is proved that on general metric measure spaces the perimeter is equal to the relaxation of the Minkowski content w.r.t. convergence in measure.

## Acknowledgements

Part of the work has been developed while A. M. was in residence at the Mathematical Science Research Institute in Berkeley, California, during the spring semester 2016 and was supported by the National Science Foundation under the Grant No. DMS-1440140.

## 2. Preliminaries

The space of all Borel probability measures over $X$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{P}(X)$. A metric space is a geodesic space if and only if for each $x, y \in X$ there exists $\gamma \in \mathrm{Geo}(X)$ so that $\gamma_0 = x, \gamma_1 = y$, with

$$\mathrm{Geo}(X) := \{\gamma \in C([0,1], X) : \mathsf{d}(\gamma_s, \gamma_t) = |s-t|\mathsf{d}(\gamma_0, \gamma_1), \text{ for every } s, t \in [0,1]\}.$$

Recall that for complete geodesic spaces local compactness is equivalent to properness (a metric space is proper if every closed ball is compact). We directly assume the ambient space $(X, \mathsf{d})$ to be proper. Hence from now on we assume the following: the ambient metric space $(X, \mathsf{d})$ is geodesic, complete, separable and proper and $\mathfrak{m}(X) = 1$. We denote by $\mathrm{Lip}(X)$ the space of real-valued Lipschitz functions over $X$. Given $u \in \mathrm{Lip}(X)$ its slope $|\nabla u|(x)$ at $x \in X$ is defined by

$$|\nabla u|(x) := \limsup_{y \to x} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{\mathsf{d}(x,y)}. \tag{2.1}$$

We follow the approach of [1, 2]. Given a Borel subset $E \subset X$ and $A$ open, the perimeter $\mathsf{P}(E, A)$ is defined as follows

$$\mathsf{P}(E,A) \quad := \quad \inf\left\{ \liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_A |\nabla u_n| \, \mathfrak{m} \, : \, u_n \in \mathrm{Lip}(A),\, u_n \to \chi_E \text{ in } L^1_{loc}(A, \mathfrak{m}) \right\}. \tag{2.2}$$

We say that $E \subset X$ has finite perimeter in $X$ if $\mathsf{P}(E, X) < \infty$. We recall also few properties of the perimeter functions:

(a) (locality) $\mathsf{P}(E, A) = \mathsf{P}(F, A)$, whenever $\mathfrak{m}(E \Delta F \cap A) = 0$;
(b) (l.s.c.) the map $E \mapsto \mathsf{P}(E, A)$ is lower-semicontinuous with respect to the $L^1_{loc}(A)$ convergence;
(c) (complementation) $\mathsf{P}(E, A) = \mathsf{P}(E^c, A)$.

Most importantly, if $E$ is a set of finite perimeter, then the set function $A \to \mathsf{P}(E, A)$ is the restriction to open sets of a finite Borel measure $\mathsf{P}(E, \cdot)$ in $X$, defined by

$$\mathsf{P}(E, B) := \inf\{\mathsf{P}(E, A) \colon A \supset B, \ A \text{ open}\}.$$

Sometimes, for ease of notation, we will write $\mathsf{P}(E)$ instead of $\mathsf{P}(E, X)$. The outer Minkowski content $\mathfrak{m}^+(E)$ of $E$ are defined respectively by

$$\mathfrak{m}^+(E) \quad := \quad \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathfrak{m}(E^\varepsilon) - \mathfrak{m}(E)}{\varepsilon},, \tag{2.3}$$

where $\chi_E$ is the characteristic function of $E$, and $E^\varepsilon := \{x \in X \, : \, \mathsf{d}(E, x) \le \varepsilon\}$. With a slight abuse of notation we denoted $\mathsf{d}(E, x) := \inf_{y \in E} \mathsf{d}(y, x)$.

It is an immediate consequence of the definition that for open sets $\mathsf{P}(E) \le \mathfrak{m}^+(E)$; let give a short proof for the reader's convenience. For the result in the smooth framework of Riemannian manifolds, see for instance [11].

**Proposition 2.1** ($\mathsf{P}(E) \le \mathfrak{m}^+(E)$)**.** *Let $(X, \mathsf{d}, \mathfrak{m})$ be a m.m.s. and $E \subset X$ be an open set. Then $\mathsf{P}(E) \le \mathfrak{m}^+(E)$.*

*Proof.* Let $\varepsilon_n \downarrow 0$ be such that

$$\mathfrak{m}^+(E) = \lim_{\varepsilon_n \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathfrak{m}(E^{\varepsilon_n}) - \mathfrak{m}(E)}{\varepsilon_n}, \tag{2.4}$$

and define $u_n(x) := \max\{0, 1 - \varepsilon_n^{-1} \mathsf{d}(x, E)\}$. Notice that if $x \in E$, since $E$ is open then $u_n \equiv 1$ on a small ball around $x$ and therefore $|\nabla u_n| \equiv 0$ on $E$. Moreover $u_n \equiv 0$ on $X \setminus E^{\varepsilon_n}$ so, since $X \setminus E^{\varepsilon_n}$ is

open, we get $|\nabla u_n| \equiv 0$ on $X \setminus E^{\varepsilon_n}$. Finally it is clear from the definition that $|\nabla u_n| \leq \varepsilon_n^{-1}$ on $E^{\varepsilon_n} \setminus E$. Combining these informations we obtain

$$\int_X |\nabla u_n| \, \mathfrak{m} \leq \frac{\mathfrak{m}(E^{\varepsilon_n} \setminus E)}{\varepsilon_n}.$$

Now we can pass to the limit as $n \to \infty$ and use (2.4) to obtain the thesis. □

Since for open sets $\mathsf{P}(\cdot) \leq \mathfrak{m}^+(\cdot)$, a priori an isoperimetric inequality expressed in terms of the perimeter is stronger than an isoperimetric inequality expressed in terms of the exterior Minkowski content. As in our previous paper [14] we established sharp and rigid isoperimetric inequalities in metric measure spaces with Ricci curvature bounded from below in terms of the exterior Minkowski content, it is a natural question whether the same inequalities (with associated rigidity and almost rigidity statements) remain valid if we replace the perimeter with the Minkowski content. The answer is affirmative and the goal of this short note is to prove this fact.

2.1. **Geometry of metric measure spaces.** Here we briefly recall the synthetic notions of lower Ricci curvature bounds, for more detail we refer to [9, 26, 35, 36, 37].

In order to formulate curvature properties for $(X, \mathsf{d}, \mathfrak{m})$ we introduce the following distortion coefficients: given two numbers $K, N \in \mathbb{R}$ with $N \geq 0$, we set for $(t, \theta) \in [0,1] \times \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\sigma_{K,N}^{(t)}(\theta) := \begin{cases} \infty, & \text{if } K\theta^2 \geq N\pi^2, \\ \dfrac{\sin(t\theta\sqrt{K/N})}{\sin(\theta\sqrt{K/N})} & \text{if } 0 < K\theta^2 < N\pi^2, \\ t & \text{if } K\theta^2 < 0 \text{ and } N = 0, \text{ or if } K\theta^2 = 0, \\ \dfrac{\sinh(t\theta\sqrt{-K/N})}{\sinh(\theta\sqrt{-K/N})} & \text{if } K\theta^2 \leq 0 \text{ and } N > 0. \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

We also set, for $N \geq 1, K \in \mathbb{R}$ and $(t, \theta) \in [0,1] \times \mathbb{R}_+$

$$\tau_{K,N}^{(t)}(\theta) := t^{1/N} \sigma_{K,N-1}^{(t)}(\theta)^{(N-1)/N}. \tag{2.6}$$

As we will consider only the case of essentially non-branching spaces, we recall the following definition.

**Definition 2.2.** A metric measure space $(X, \mathsf{d}, \mathfrak{m})$ is *essentially non-branching* if and only if for any $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$, with $\mu_0$ absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathfrak{m}$, any element of $\mathrm{OptGeo}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ is concentrated on a set of non-branching geodesics.

A set $F \subset \mathrm{Geo}(X)$ is a set of non-branching geodesics if and only if for any $\gamma^1, \gamma^2 \in F$, it holds:

$$\exists\, \bar{t} \in (0,1) \text{ such that } \ \forall t \in [0, \bar{t}] \quad \gamma_t^1 = \gamma_t^2 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \gamma_s^1 = \gamma_s^2, \quad \forall s \in [0,1].$$

**Definition 2.3** ($\mathsf{CD}$ condition)**.** An essentially non-branching m.m.s. $(X, \mathsf{d}, \mathfrak{m})$ verifies $\mathsf{CD}(K, N)$ if and only if for each pair $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_2(X, \mathsf{d}, \mathfrak{m})$ there exists $\nu \in \mathrm{OptGeo}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ such that

$$\varrho_t^{-1/N}(\gamma_t) \geq \tau_{K,N}^{(1-t)}(\mathsf{d}(\gamma_0, \gamma_1)) \varrho_0^{-1/N}(\gamma_0) + \tau_{K,N}^{(t)}(\mathsf{d}(\gamma_0, \gamma_1)) \varrho_1^{-1/N}(\gamma_1), \qquad \nu\text{-a.e. } \gamma \in \mathrm{Geo}(X), \tag{2.7}$$

for all $t \in [0,1]$, where $(\mathrm{e}_t)_\sharp \nu = \varrho_t \mathfrak{m}$.

For the general definition of $\mathsf{CD}(K, N)$ see [26, 35, 36]. It is worth recalling that if $(M, g)$ is a Riemannian manifold of dimension $n$ and $h \in C^2(M)$ with $h > 0$, then the m.m.s. $(M, g, h\, vol)$ verifies $\mathsf{CD}(K, N)$ with $N \geq n$ if and only if (see Theorem 1.7 of [36])

$$Ric_{g,h,N} \geq Kg, \qquad Ric_{g,h,N} := Ric_g - (N-n) \frac{\nabla_g^2 h^{\frac{1}{N-n}}}{h^{\frac{1}{N-n}}}.$$

In particular if $N = n$ the generalized Ricci tensor $Ric_{g,h,N} = Ric_g$ makes sense only if $h$ is constant. In particular, if $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ is any interval, $h \in C^2(I)$ and $\mathcal{L}^1$ is the one-dimensional Lebesgue measure, the m.m.s. $(I, |\cdot|, h\mathcal{L}^1)$ verifies $\mathsf{CD}(K, N)$ if and only if

$$\left(h^{\frac{1}{N-1}}\right)'' + \frac{K}{N-1} h^{\frac{1}{N-1}} \leq 0. \tag{2.8}$$

We also mention the more recent Riemannian curvature dimension condition $\mathsf{RCD}^*$. This consists in an enforcement of the so called reduced curvature dimension condition, denoted by $\mathsf{CD}^*(K, N)$ and

introduced in [9]: the additional condition is that the Sobolev space $W^{1,2}(X,\mathfrak{m})$ is an Hilbert space, see [6, 7, 5]. A remarkable feature of the $\mathsf{RCD}^*(K,N)$ condition is the equivalence with the dimensional Bochner inequality [18, 8].

The reduced $\mathsf{CD}^*(K,N)$ condition asks for the same inequality (2.7) of $\mathsf{CD}(K,N)$ but the coefficients $\tau^{(t)}_{K,N}(\mathsf{d}(\gamma_0,\gamma_1))$ and $\tau^{(1-t)}_{K,N}(\mathsf{d}(\gamma_0,\gamma_1))$ are replaced by $\sigma^{(t)}_{K,N}(\mathsf{d}(\gamma_0,\gamma_1))$ and $\sigma^{(1-t)}_{K,N}(\mathsf{d}(\gamma_0,\gamma_1))$, respectively.

Hence while the distortion coefficients of the $\mathsf{CD}(K,N)$ condition are formally obtained imposing one direction with linear distortion and $N-1$ directions affected by curvature, the $\mathsf{CD}^*(K,N)$ condition imposes the same volume distortion in all the $N$ directions.

For both definitions there is a local version that is of some relevance for our analysis. Here we state only the local formulation $\mathsf{CD}(K,N)$, being clear what would be the one for $\mathsf{CD}^*(K,N)$.

**Definition 2.4** ($\mathsf{CD}_{loc}$ condition)**.** An essentially non-branching m.m.s. $(X,\mathsf{d},\mathfrak{m})$ satisfies $\mathsf{CD}_{loc}(K,N)$ if for any point $x\in X$ there exists a neighborhood $X(x)$ of $x$ such that for each pair $\mu_0,\mu_1\in\mathcal{P}_2(X,\mathsf{d},\mathfrak{m})$ supported in $X(x)$ there exists $\nu\in\mathrm{OptGeo}(\mu_0,\mu_1)$ such that (2.7) holds true for all $t\in[0,1]$. The support of $(\mathrm{e}_t)_\sharp\,\nu$ is not necessarily contained in the neighborhood $X(x)$.

One of the main properties of the reduced curvature dimension condition is the globalization one: under the essentially non-branching property, $\mathsf{CD}^*_{loc}(K,N)$ and $\mathsf{CD}^*(K,N)$ are equivalent (see [9, Corollary 5.4]), i.e. the $\mathsf{CD}^*$-condition verifies the local-to-global property.

2.2. **The model Isoperimetric profile function $\mathcal{I}_{K,N,D}$.** If $K>0$ and $N\in\mathbb{N}$, by the Levy-Gromov isoperimetric inequality we know that, for $N$-dimensional smooth manifolds having Ricci $\geq K$, the isoperimetric profile function is bounded below by the one of the $N$-dimensional round sphere of the suitable radius. In other words the *model* isoperimetric profile function is the one of $\mathbb{S}^N$. For $N\geq 1, K\in\mathbb{R}$ arbitrary real numbers the situation is more complicated, and just recently E. Milman [28] discovered what is the model isoperimetric profile. In this short section we recall its definition.

Given $\delta>0$, set

$$s_\delta(t):=\begin{cases}\sin(\sqrt{\delta}t)/\sqrt{\delta} & \delta>0\\ t & \delta=0\\ \sinh(\sqrt{-\delta}t)/\sqrt{-\delta} & \delta<0\end{cases},\quad c_\delta(t):=\begin{cases}\cos(\sqrt{\delta}t) & \delta>0\\ 1 & \delta=0\\ \cosh(\sqrt{-\delta}t) & \delta<0\end{cases}.$$

Given a continuous function $f:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ with $f(0)\geq 0$, we denote by $f_+:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}^+$ the function coinciding with $f$ between its first non-positive and first positive roots, and vanishing everywhere else, i.e. $f_+:=f\chi_{[\xi_-,\xi_+]}$ with $\xi_-=\sup\{\xi\leq 0; f(\xi)=0\}$ and $\xi_+=\inf\{\xi>0; f(\xi)=0\}$.

Given $H,K\in\mathbb{R}$ and $N\in[1,\infty)$, set $\delta:=K/(N-1)$ and define the following (Jacobian) function of $t\in\mathbb{R}$:

$$J_{H,K,N}(t):=\begin{cases}\chi_{\{t=0\}} & N=1,K>0\\ \chi_{\{Ht\geq 0\}} & N=1,K\leq 0\\ \Big(c_\delta(t)+\frac{H}{N-1}s_\delta(t)\Big)_+^{N-1} & N\in(1,\infty)\end{cases}. \tag{2.9}$$

As last piece of notation, given a non-negative integrable function $f$ on a closed interval $L\subset\mathbb{R}$, we denote with $\mu_{f,L}$ the probability measure supported in $L$ with density (with respect to the Lebesgue measure) proportional to $f$ there. In order to simplify a bit the notation we will write $\mathcal{I}_{(L,f)}$ in place of $\mathcal{I}_{(L,|\cdot|,\mu_{f,L})}$. The model isoperimetric profile for spaces having Ricci $\geq K$, for some $K\in\mathbb{R}$, dimension bounded above by $N\geq 1$ and diameter at most $D\in(0,\infty]$ is then defined by

$$\mathcal{I}_{K,N,D}(v):=\inf_{H\in\mathbb{R},a\in[0,D]}\mathcal{I}_{([-a,D-a],J_{H,K,N})}(v),\quad\forall v\in[0,1]. \tag{2.10}$$

The formula above has the advantage of considering all the possible cases in just one equation, but probably it is also instructive to isolate the different cases in a more explicit way. Indeed one can check [28, Section 4] that:

- **Case 1**: $K>0$ and $D<\sqrt{\frac{N-1}{K}}\pi$,

$$\mathcal{I}_{K,N,D}(v)=\inf_{\xi\in\left[0,\sqrt{\frac{N-1}{K}}\pi-D\right]}\mathcal{I}_{\left([\xi,\xi+D],\sin(\sqrt{\frac{K}{N-1}}t)^{N-1}\right)}(v),\quad\forall v\in[0,1]\ .$$

- **Case 2**: $K > 0$ and $D \geq \sqrt{\frac{N-1}{K}}\pi$,
$$\mathcal{I}_{K,N,D}(v) = \mathcal{I}_{\left([0,\sqrt{\frac{N-1}{K}}\pi],\sin(\sqrt{\frac{K}{N-1}}t)^{N-1}\right)}(v), \quad \forall v \in [0,1] .$$
- **Case 3**: $K = 0$ and $D < \infty$,
$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}_{K,N,D}(v) &= \min\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \inf_{\xi\geq 0} \mathcal{I}_{([\xi,\xi+D],t^{N-1})}(v) \ , \\ \mathcal{I}_{([0,D],1)}(v) \end{array} \right\} \\ &= \frac{N}{D}\inf_{\xi\geq 0} \frac{\left(\min(v,1-v)(\xi+1)^N + \max(v,1-v)\xi^N\right)^{\frac{N-1}{N}}}{(\xi+1)^N - \xi^N}, \quad \forall v \in [0,1] .\end{aligned}$$
- **Case 4**: $K < 0$, $D < \infty$:
$$\mathcal{I}_{K,N,D}(v) = \min\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \inf_{\xi\geq 0} \mathcal{I}_{\left([\xi,\xi+D],\ \sinh(\sqrt{\frac{-K}{N-1}}t)^{N-1}\right)}(v) \ , \\ \mathcal{I}_{\left([0,D],\exp(\sqrt{-K(N-1)}t)\right)}(v) \ , \\ \inf_{\xi\in\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{I}_{\left([\xi,\xi+D],\ \cosh(\sqrt{\frac{-K}{N-1}}t)^{N-1}\right)}(v) \end{array} \right\} \quad \forall v \in [0,1] .$$
- In all the remaining cases, that is for $K \leq 0, D = \infty$, the model profile trivializes: $\mathcal{I}_{K,N.D}(v) = 0$ for every $v \in [0,1]$.

Note that when $N$ is an integer,
$$\mathcal{I}_{\left([0,\sqrt{\frac{N-1}{K}}\pi],(\sin(\sqrt{\frac{K}{N-1}}t)^{N-1}\right)} = \mathcal{I}_{(\mathbb{S}^N, g^K_{can}, \mu^K_{can})}$$
by the isoperimetric inequality on the sphere, and so Case 2 with $N$ integer corresponds to Lévy-Gromov isoperimetric inequality.

2.3. **Disintegration of measures.** We include here a version of the Disintegration Theorem (for a comprehensive treatment see for instance [19]).

Given a measurable space $(R, \mathscr{R})$, i.e. $\mathscr{R}$ is a $\sigma$-algebra of subsets of $R$, and a function $\mathfrak{Q} : R \to Q$, with $Q$ general set, we can endow $Q$ with the *push forward $\sigma$-algebra* $\mathcal{Q}$ of $\mathscr{R}$:
$$C \in \mathcal{Q} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \mathfrak{Q}^{-1}(C) \in \mathscr{R},$$
which could be also defined as the biggest $\sigma$-algebra on $Q$ such that $\mathfrak{Q}$ is measurable. Moreover given a probability measure $\rho$ on $(R, \mathscr{R})$, define a probability measure $\mathfrak{q}$ on $(Q, \mathcal{Q})$ by push forward via $\mathfrak{Q}$, i.e. $\mathfrak{q} := \mathfrak{Q}_\sharp \rho$.

**Definition 2.5.** A *disintegration* of $\rho$ *consistent with* $\mathfrak{Q}$ is a map (with slight abuse of notation still denoted by) $\rho : \mathscr{R} \times Q \to [0,1]$ such that, setting $\rho_q(B) := \rho(B, q)$, the following hold:

(1) $\rho_q(\cdot)$ is a probability measure on $(R, \mathscr{R})$ for all $q \in Q$,
(2) $\rho_\cdot(B)$ is $\mathfrak{q}$-measurable for all $B \in \mathscr{R}$,

and satisfies for all $B \in \mathscr{R}, C \in \mathcal{Q}$ the consistency condition
$$\rho\left(B \cap \mathfrak{Q}^{-1}(C)\right) = \int_C \rho_q(B)\, \mathfrak{q}(dq).$$

A disintegration is *strongly consistent with respect to* $\mathfrak{Q}$ if for all $q$ we have $\rho_q(\mathfrak{Q}^{-1}(q)) = 1$. The measures $\rho_q$ are called *conditional probabilities*.

We recall the following version of the disintegration theorem that can be found in [19, Section 452]. Recall that a $\sigma$-algebra $\mathcal{J}$ is *countably generated* if there exists a countable family of sets so that $\mathcal{J}$ coincide with the smallest $\sigma$-algebra containing them.

**Theorem 2.6** (Disintegration of measures)**.** *Assume that $(R, \mathscr{R}, \rho)$ is a countably generated probability space and $R = \cup_{q\in Q} R_q$ is a partition of $R$. Denote with $\mathfrak{Q} : R \to Q$ the quotient map:*
$$q = \mathfrak{Q}(x) \iff x \in R_q,$$
*and with $(Q, \mathcal{Q}, \mathfrak{q})$ the quotient measure space. Assume $(Q, \mathcal{Q}) = (X, \mathcal{B}(X))$ with $X$ Polish space, where $\mathcal{B}(X)$ denotes the Borel $\sigma$-algebra. Then there exists a unique strongly consistent disintegration $q \mapsto \rho_q$ w.r.t. $\mathfrak{Q}$, where uniqueness is understood in the following sense: if $\rho_1, \rho_2$ are two consistent disintegrations then $\rho_{1,q}(\cdot) = \rho_{2,q}(\cdot)$ for $\mathfrak{q}$-a.e. $q \in Q$.*

2.4. **1-D localization.** Before stating the next result let us recall that $\mathsf{CD}^*(K,N)$ and $\mathsf{CD}_{loc}(K,N)$ are equivalent if $1 < N < \infty$ or $N = 1$ and $K \geq 0$, but for $N = 1$ and $K < 0$ the $\mathsf{CD}_{loc}(K,N)$ condition is strictly stronger than $\mathsf{CD}^*(K,N)$.

**Theorem 2.7.** *Let $(X, \mathsf{d}, \mathfrak{m})$ be an essentially non-branching metric measure space verifying the $\mathsf{CD}_{loc}(K,N)$ condition for some $K \in \mathbb{R}$ and $N \in [1,\infty)$. Let $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ be $\mathfrak{m}$-integrable such that $\int_X f\,\mathfrak{m} = 0$ and assume the existence of $x_0 \in X$ such that $\int_X |f(x)|\,\mathsf{d}(x,x_0)\,\mathfrak{m}(dx) < \infty$.*

*Then the space $X$ can be written as the disjoint union of two sets $Z$ and $\mathcal{T}$ with $\mathcal{T}$ admitting a partition $\{X_q\}_{q\in Q}$ and a corresponding disintegration of $\mathfrak{m}\llcorner_{\mathcal{T}}$, $\{\mathfrak{m}_q\}_{q\in Q}$ such that:*

- *For any $\mathfrak{m}$-measurable set $B \subset \mathcal{T}$ it holds*
$$\mathfrak{m}(B) = \int_Q \mathfrak{m}_q(B)\,\mathfrak{q}(dq),$$
*where $\mathfrak{q}$ is a probability measure over $Q$ defined on the quotient $\sigma$-algebra $\mathcal{Q}$.*
- *For $\mathfrak{q}$-almost every $q \in Q$, the set $X_q$ is a geodesic and $\mathfrak{m}_q$ is supported on it. Moreover $q \mapsto \mathfrak{m}_q$ is a $\mathsf{CD}(K,N)$ disintegration, i.e. for $\mathfrak{q}$-a.e. $q \in Q$ the following curvature inequality holds:*

$$h_q((1-s)t_0 + st_1)^{1/(N-1)} \geq \sigma^{(1-s)}_{K,N-1}(t_1-t_0)h_q(t_0)^{1/(N-1)} + \sigma^{(s)}_{K,N-1}(t_1-t_0)h_q(t_1)^{1/(N-1)}, \tag{2.11}$$

*for all $s \in [0,1]$ and for all $t_0, t_1 \in Dom\,(g(q,\cdot))$ with $t_0 < t_1$. If $N = 1$, for $\mathfrak{q}$-a.e. $q \in Q$ the density $h_q$ is constant.*
- *For $\mathfrak{q}$-almost every $q \in Q$, it holds $\int_{X_q} f\,\mathfrak{m}_q = 0$ and $f = 0$ $\mathfrak{m}$-a.e. in $Z$.*

Let us also mention that we can define a Borel *ray map* $g : \mathrm{Dom}(g) \subset Q \times \mathbb{R} \to X$ such that for every $q \in Q$, the map $\mathbb{R} \supset \mathrm{Dom}\,(g(q,\cdot)) \ni t \mapsto g(q,t)$ is an arc-length parametrization of the geodesic $X_q$, i.e.

$$X_q = g(q,\cdot)(\mathrm{Dom}\,(g(q,\cdot))) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathsf{d}(g(q,s),g(q,t)) = |t-s|, \quad \forall q \in Q, \forall s,t \in \mathrm{Dom}\,(g(q,\cdot)).$$

For more details see [10, Section 4], [14, Section 3] and [16].

## 3. Isoperimetric inequalities in terms of the perimeter

3.1. **The one dimensional case.** Given $K \in \mathbb{R}, N \in [1,+\infty)$ and $D \in (0,+\infty]$, consider the following family of probability measures

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}^s_{K,N,D} := \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) :\ & \mathrm{supp}(\mu) \subset [0,D],\ \mu = h_\mu \mathcal{L}^1,\ h_\mu \text{ verifies (2.11) and is continuous if } N \in (1,\infty),\\ & h_\mu \equiv \text{const if } N = 1\}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

In what follows we will assume $h_\mu$ to be defined on the whole $\mathbb{R}$, vanishing outside of $\mathrm{supp}(\mu)$.
Denote with $\mathcal{I}^s_{K,N,D}$ the corresponding comparison *synthetic* isoperimetric profile

$$\mathcal{I}^s_{K,N,D}(v) := \inf\left\{\mu^+(A) \colon A \subset \mathbb{R},\ \mu(A) = v,\ \mu \in \mathcal{F}^s_{K,N,D}\right\},$$

where $\mu^+(A)$ denotes the Minkowski content. The term synthetic refers to $\mu \in \mathcal{F}^s_{K,N,D}$ meaning that the Ricci curvature bound is satisfied in its synthetic formulation: if $\mu = h \cdot \mathcal{L}^1$, then $h$ verifies (2.11). It was proved in [14, Theorem 6.3] that for every $v \in [0,1]$ it holds $\mathcal{I}^s_{K,N,D}(v) = \mathcal{I}_{K,N,D}(v)$, where $\mathcal{I}_{K,N,D}(v)$ was defined in (2.10).

It is worth also specifying the formula (2.2) to the one dimensional case. So if $(\mathrm{supp}(\mu), |\cdot|, \mu) \in \mathcal{F}^s_{K,N,D}$ and $B$ is a Borel set:

$$\mathsf{P}_{(\mathrm{supp}(\mu),|\cdot|,\mu)}(B) = \inf\left\{\liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathrm{supp}(\mu)} |u_n'| h\,\mathcal{L}^1 \ :\ u_n \in \mathrm{Lip}(\mathrm{supp}(\mu)),\ u_n \to \chi_B \text{ in } L^1_{loc}(\mu)\right\}. \tag{3.2}$$

Since $\mu \in \mathcal{F}^s_{K,N,D}$, it follows that $\mathrm{supp}(\mu)$ is an interval; so we can assume it, up to a translation, to be a subset of $[0,D]$. Note that from the locality of the perimeter, if $E \subset \mathrm{supp}(\mu)$ then

$$\mathsf{P}_{(\mathrm{supp}(\mu),|\cdot|,\mu)}(E) = \mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E).$$

In the next lemma we show that, in the one dimensional case, the perimeter has a precise representation.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let $\mu = h_\mu \mathcal{L}^1 \in \mathcal{F}^s_{K,N,D}$ and let $E \subset \mathrm{supp}(\mu)$ be a Borel subset with $\mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E) < \infty$. Then there exist countably many disjoint closed intervals $\{[a_i, b_i]\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\mu(E \triangle \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}}[a_i, b_i]) = 0$, and*

$$\mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E) = \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \big(h_\mu(a_i) + h_\mu(b_i)\big).$$

Note that the disjoint closed intervals given by Proposition 3.1 are not necessarily subsets of $\mathrm{supp}(\mu)$. In particular it may happen that $h_\mu(a_i) = 0$ or $h_\mu(b_j) = 0$ for some $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$. Note moreover that from the disjointness of the family of closed intervals verifying $\mu(E \triangle \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}}[a_i, b_i]) = 0$ it follows also their uniqueness inside $\mathrm{supp}(\mu)$.

*Proof.* **Step 1.** $E$ is countable union of intervals.
If $D = 0$ everything trivializes so we can assume $D > 0$. Up to choosing a smaller $D \geq 0$ and up to a shift of the interval we can also assume that $0 = \inf\{t \in [0, D] : h(t) > 0)\}$ and $D = \sup\{t \in [0, D] : h(t) > 0)\}$. First of all observe that since $1 = \mu([0, D]) = \int_{[0,D]} h_\mu(t)\mathcal{L}^1(dt)$, there exists $t_0 \in [0, D]$ such that $h(t_0) \geq 1/D$. Since $h(\cdot)$ satisfies the concavity condition (2.11), from the explicit expression of the coefficients $\sigma$ given in (2.5), it is not difficult to check that

$$h_\mu(t) > 0 \ \forall t \in (0, D) \ \text{ and } \ \exists\, C = C(K, N, D) > 0 \text{ such that } \ h_\mu(t) \geq C \ \min\{t, D - t\}^{N-1}. \tag{3.3}$$

It follows directly from (3.2) and (3.3) that

$$\mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E) \geq \mathsf{P}_{([\varepsilon,D-\varepsilon],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E) \geq C \min\{\varepsilon, D - \varepsilon\}^{N-1} \cdot \mathsf{P}_{([\varepsilon,D-\varepsilon],|\cdot|,\mathcal{L}^1)}(E).$$

It follows from standard results on one-dimensional sets of finite perimeter w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure (see for istance [3]) that, up to an $\mathcal{L}^1$-negligible subset, $\bar{E} \cap [\varepsilon, D - \varepsilon]$ is the finite union of disjoint closed intervals contained in $[\varepsilon, D - \varepsilon]$. Repeating the same argument with a sequence of $\varepsilon_n \to 0$, it follows that $\bar{E}$, up to a set of $\mu$-measure zero, is the countable union of disjoint closed intervals, say $\{[a_i, b_i]\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$.

**Step 2.** Representation formula.
Let us first prove the inequality

$$\mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E) \geq \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} h_\mu(a_i) + h_\mu(b_i). \tag{3.4}$$

First of all, since the perimeter is additive over sets at strictly positive distance, we observe that $\mathsf{P}_{([\varepsilon,D-\varepsilon],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E) = \mathsf{P}_{([\varepsilon,D-\varepsilon],|\cdot|,\mu)}(\cup_{i\in I_\varepsilon}[a_i, b_i])$, for every finite subset $\varepsilon > 0$. It follows that

$$\mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E) \geq \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}([a_i, b_i]). \tag{3.5}$$

Now we show that

$$\mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}([a_i, b_i]) = h_\mu(a_i) + h_\mu(b_i). \tag{3.6}$$

First notice that by taking $u_n$ constantly equal to 1 on $[a_i, b_i]$, equal to 0 on $[0, a_i - 1/n]$ and $[b_i + 1/n, D]$, and affine elsewhere, we get

$$\int_{\mathrm{supp}(\mu)} |u_n(x)'| h_\mu(x) dx = \frac{1}{n}\left(\int_{[a_i-1/n,a_i]} h_\mu(x)dx + \int_{[b_i,b_i+1/n]} h_\mu(x)dx\right),$$

yielding $\mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}([a_i, b_i]) \leq h_\mu(a_i) + h_\mu(b_i)$.

Consider now any sequence of Lipschitz functions $u_n$ converging to $\chi_{[a_i,b_i]}$ in $L^1_{loc}(\mu)$ and observe that without loss of generality we can assume that $0 \leq u_n \leq 1$ (otherwise we can truncate the function finding a sequence with lower energy). For the same reason, possibly taking a subsequence $u_n \to \chi_{[a_i,b_i]}$ pointwise a.e., we can assume that

$$u_n^{-1}((0, 1/n)) = [0, x_n^-) \cup (x_n^+, D]$$

and

$$u_n^{-1}((1 - 1/n, 1]) = (y_n^-, y_n^+),$$

with $x_n^- < y_n^- < y_n^+ < x_n^+$, and $x_n^-, y_n^- \to a_i$ and $x_n^+, y_n^+ \to b_i$. Finally we may also assume $|u_n'| = u_n'$ in $(x_n^-, y_n^-)$ and $|u_n'| = -u_n'$ in $(x_n^+, y_n^+)$. Now define

$$\hat{u}_n(x) := \begin{cases} 1/n, & [0, x_n^-) \cup (x_n^+, D]; \\ 1 - 1/n, & (y_n^-, y_n^+); \\ u_n, & \text{elsewhere.} \end{cases}$$

Integrating by parts, it follows straightforwardly that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathrm{supp}(\mu)} |\hat{u}_n'(x)| h(x) dx = h_\mu(a_i) + h_\mu(b_i).$$

Therefore (3.6) is proved and it follows that

$$\mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E) \geq \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} h_\mu(a_i) + h_\mu(b_i).$$

To show the converse inequality, consider $u_n$ to be the affine approximations of $\sum_{i\leq n} \chi_{[a_i,b_i]}$, constructed as follows: assume that $a_i > b_{i+1} > a_{i+1}$ and $a_i, b_i \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$; then for each $n$ consider $m(n) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$a_i - b_{i+1} > \frac{2}{m(n)}, \qquad \text{for each } i \leq n.$$

and such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{nL_n}{m(n)} = 0, \tag{3.7}$$

where $L_n$ is the Lipschitz constant of $h_\mu$ restricted on $[b_{n+1}, b_1 + (D - b_1)/2]$. Then define $u_n$ to be equal 1 on $\cup_{i\leq n}[a_i, b_i]$, to be 0 on

$$\bigcup_{i<n} [b_{i+1} + 1/m(n), a_i - 1/m(n)] \cup [b_1 + 1/m(n), D] \cup [0, a_n - 1/m(n)];$$

finally define $u_n$ affine elsewhere, so that $u_n$ will be Lipschitz. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathrm{supp}(\mu)} |u_n'(x)| h_\mu(x) dx &= \sum_{i\leq n} m(n) \left( \int_{[a_i - 1/m(n), a_i]} h_\mu(x) dx + \int_{[b_i, b_i + 1/m(n)]} h_\mu(x) dx \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i\leq n} h_\mu(a_i) + \frac{1}{m(n)} L_n + h_\mu(b_i) \\ &\leq \frac{nL_n}{m(n)} + \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} h_\mu(a_i) + h_\mu(b_i). \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (3.7) that

$$\mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E) \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathrm{supp}(\mu)} |u_n'(x)| h_\mu(x)\, dx \leq \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} h_\mu(a_i) + h_\mu(b_i).$$

The claim follows. □

We then obtain the following

**Corollary 3.2.** *Let $\mu = h_\mu \mathcal{L}^1 \in \mathcal{F}^s_{K,N,D}$, then*

$$\inf\{\mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E) : E \subset [0,D],\ \mu(E) = v\} = \inf\{\mu^+(E) : E \subset [0,D],\ \mu(E) = v\} \geq \mathcal{I}_{K,N,D}(v), \tag{3.8}$$

*where $\mathcal{I}_{K,N,D}(v)$ was defined in* (2.10).

*Proof.* By Proposition 3.1, for each $E \subset [0, D]$ of finite perimeter there exists $F = \cup_{i\in\mathbb{N}}[a_i, b_i]$ such that $\mu(E \Delta F) = 0$ and

$$\mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E) = \mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(F) = \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} h_\mu(a_i) + h_\mu(b_i).$$

We consider for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the family $\mathcal{E}_n$ of sets $E$ of finite perimeter admitting a representative $F$ made of at most $n$ disjoint closed intervals. We claim that

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf\{\mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E) \ : \ E \subset [0,D],\ \mu(E) = v\} \\ &\qquad = \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \inf_{E\in\mathcal{E}_n} \{\mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E) \ : \ E \subset [0,D],\ \mu(E) = v\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

Indeed the inequality $\leq$ is straightforward; for the reverse inequality, consider $E \subset X$ such that $\mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E) < \infty$ and the corresponding set $F = \cup_i [a_i, b_i]$ made of countably many disjoint closed intervals with

$$\mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E) = \mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(F) = \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} h_\mu(a_i) + h_\mu(b_i).$$

Since $h$ can be zero only on the boundary of $\mathrm{supp}(\mu) = [\alpha, \beta]$, the family of disjoint closed sets can accumulate only at $\alpha$ or $\beta$. With no loss of generality we only consider the case they accumulate at $\alpha = 0$ and (necessarily) $h_\mu(0) = 0$. So we can assume $a_{i+1} < b_{i+1} < a_i < b_i$ and $a_i, b_i \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$. Now consider $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sum_{i\geq n} h_\mu(a_i) + h_\mu(b_i) \leq \varepsilon.$$

If $v_\varepsilon = \mu(\cup_{i\geq n}[a_i, b_i])$, consider $a_\varepsilon$ the unique element of $[0, D]$ such that $\mu([0, a_\varepsilon]) = v_\varepsilon$. Note that $a_\varepsilon < b_n$; in particular $a_\varepsilon \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Then define the new set $E_\varepsilon := [0, a_\varepsilon] \bigcup \cup_{i<n}[a_i, b_i]$: by construction $\mu(E) = \mu(E_\varepsilon)$ and $E_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{E}_{n+1}$. Then observe that

$$\mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E) = \mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E_\varepsilon) + \sum_{i\geq n} h_\mu(a_i) + h_\mu(b_i) - h_\mu(a_\varepsilon).$$

Then we have proved that for each $E$ of finite perimeter and every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $E_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{E}_{n+1}$ with $n$ depending on $\varepsilon$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E) &\geq \mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E_\varepsilon) - h_\mu(a_\varepsilon) \\ &\geq \inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \inf_{E\in\mathcal{E}_n} \{\mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E) \ : \ E \subset [0,D],\ \mu(E) = v\} - h_\mu(a_\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$, we obtain the converse inequality and the identity (3.9) is proved. Since on finite unions of closed intervals the Minkowski content and the perimeter coincide, it follows that

$$\mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E) \geq \inf\{\mu^+(B) \ : \ B \subset [0,D],\ \mu(B) = v\}.$$

To obtain the reverse inequality, just observe that for each set $E$ of finite perimeter, by removing the boundary points to the intervals $[a_i, b_i]$, we can also take $F$ open. Then from Proposition 2.1 it follows that

$$\mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(E) = \mathsf{P}_{([0,D],|\cdot|,\mu)}(F) \leq \mathfrak{m}^+(F) \leq \mathfrak{m}^+(E).$$

Taking the inf, the equality in (3.8) follows. To prove the inequality in (3.8), just recall that it is one of the main results of [28]. □

## 4. Proof of the main results

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* First of all we can assume $D < \infty$ and therefore $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$: indeed from the Bonnet-Myers Theorem if $K > 0$ then $D < \infty$, and if $K \leq 0$ and $D = \infty$ then the model isoperimetric profile (2.10) trivializes, i.e. $\mathcal{I}_{K,N,\infty} \equiv 0$ for $K \leq 0$. Also, for $v = 0, 1$ one has $\mathcal{I}_{K,N,D}(0) = \mathcal{I}_{K,N,D}(1) = 0$, so again there is nothing to prove. Therefore, without loss of generality we can assume $v = \mathfrak{m}(E) \in (0, 1)$.

Let $\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathrm{Lip}(X)$ be such that

$$\mathsf{P}(E) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_X |\nabla u_n| \, \mathfrak{m}, \quad u_n \to \chi_E \text{ in } L^1_{loc}(X, \mathfrak{m}). \tag{4.1}$$

Consider the $\mathfrak{m}$-measurable function $f(x) := \chi_E(x) - v$ and notice that $\int_X f \, \mathfrak{m} = 0$. Thus $f$ verifies the hypothesis of Theorem 2.7 and noticing that $f$ is never null, we can decompose $X = Y \cup \mathcal{T}$ with

$$\mathfrak{m}(Y) = 0, \qquad \mathfrak{m}\llcorner_{\mathcal{T}} = \int_Q \mathfrak{m}_q \, \mathfrak{q}(dq),$$

with $\mathfrak{m}_q = g(q,\cdot)_\sharp\left(h_q\cdot\mathcal{L}^1\right)$; moreover, for $\mathfrak{q}$-a.e. $q\in Q$, the density $h_q$ verifies (2.11) and

$$\int_X f(z)\,\mathfrak{m}_q(dz) = \int_{\mathrm{Dom}\,(g(q,\cdot))} f(g(q,t))\cdot h_q(t)\,\mathcal{L}^1(dt) = 0.$$

Therefore

$$v = \mathfrak{m}_q(E\cap\{g(q,t) : t\in\mathbb{R}\}) = (h_q\mathcal{L}^1)(g(q,\cdot)^{-1}(E)), \quad \text{for } \mathfrak{q}\text{-a.e. } q\in Q. \tag{4.2}$$

Observing that the map $\mathrm{Dom}\,(g(q,\cdot)\ni t\mapsto u_n\circ g(q,t)\in\mathbb{R}$ is Lipschitz and therefore differentiable $\mathcal{L}^1$-a.e., we get that $|\nabla u_n|(g(q,t))\geq\left|\frac{d}{dt}(u_n\circ g(q,t))\right|$ for $\mathcal{L}^1$-a.e. $t\in\mathrm{Dom}\,(g(q,\cdot)$. This implies

$$\begin{aligned}\int_X |\nabla u_n|(x)\,\mathfrak{m}(dx) &= \int_{\mathcal{T}} |\nabla u_n|(x)\,\mathfrak{m}(dx)\,\mathfrak{m}(dx)\\ &= \int_Q\left(\int_X |\nabla u_n|(x)\,\mathfrak{m}_q(dx)\right)\mathfrak{q}(dq)\\ &\geq \int_Q\left(\int_{\mathrm{Dom}\,(g(q,\cdot))}\left|\frac{d}{dt}(u_n\circ g(q,t))\right| h_q(t)\,\mathcal{L}^1(dt)\right)\mathfrak{q}(dq).\end{aligned}$$

Now we note that for $\mathfrak{q}$-a.e. $q\in Q$, it holds $u_n\circ g(q,\cdot)\to\chi_{g(q,\cdot)^{-1}(E)}$ in $L^1_{loc}(\mathrm{Dom}\,(g(q,\cdot)), h_q\,\mathcal{L}^1)$, therefore passing to the limit as $n\to\infty$ in the last inequality, using Fatou's Lemma and the definition of perimeter we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{P}(E) &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\int_X |\nabla u_n|(x)\,\mathfrak{m}(dx)\\ &\geq \int_Q\left(\int_{\mathrm{Dom}\,(g(q,\cdot))}\liminf_{n\to\infty}\left|\frac{d}{dt}(u_n\circ g(q,t))\right| h_q(t)\,\mathcal{L}^1(dt)\right)\mathfrak{q}(dq)\\ &\geq \int_Q\left(\int_{\mathrm{Dom}\,(g(q,\cdot))}\mathcal{P}_{(\mathrm{Dom}\,(g(q,\cdot)),|\cdot|,h_q\,\mathcal{L}^1)}(g(q,\cdot)^{-1}(E))\right)\mathfrak{q}(dq).\end{aligned}$$

But by construction $(h_q\,\mathcal{L}^1)(g(q,\cdot)^{-1}(E)) = v$ for $\mathfrak{q}$-a.e. $q\in Q$, therefore thanks to Corollary 3.2 we infer that $\mathsf{P}_{(\mathrm{Dom}\,(g(q,\cdot)),|\cdot|,h_q\,\mathcal{L}^1)}(g(q,\cdot)^{-1}(E))\geq\mathcal{I}_{K,N,D}(v)$. We conclude that

$$\mathsf{P}(E)\geq\int_Q\mathcal{I}_{K,N,D}(v)\mathfrak{q}(dq) = \mathcal{I}_{K,N,D}(v),$$

since $\mathfrak{q}(Q) = 1$. □

4.1. **The Cheeger constant.** Recall that the Cheeger constant $h_{(X,\mathsf{d},\mathfrak{m})}$ is defined by

$$h_{(X,\mathsf{d},\mathfrak{m})} := \inf\left\{\frac{\mathsf{P}(E)}{\mathfrak{m}(E)} \;:\; E\subset X \text{ is Borel and } \mathfrak{m}(E)\in(0,1/2]\right\}.$$

In analogy with the model isoperimetric profile, we can also define a model Cheeger constant as follows. The model Cheeger constant for spaces having Ricci curvature bounded below by $K\in\mathbb{R}$, dimension bounded above by $N\geq 1$ and diameter at most $D\in(0,\infty]$ is defined by

$$h_{K,N,D} := \inf_{H\in\mathbb{R},a\in[0,D]} h_{([-a,D-a],J_{H,K,N})}, \tag{4.3}$$

where $J_{H,K,N}$ was defined in (2.9), see also thereafter for a more explicit form.

In [15, Section 5], the authors studied the variant of the Cheeger constant when the perimeter is replaces by the outer Minkowski content and used the results of [14] to infer sharp comparison and almost rigidity. Since after this short note we have at disposal the same results expressed in terms of the perimeter (which we remark are a priori stronger), we can repeat verbatim the proofs of [15, Theorem 5.3, Corollary 5.3] just replacing the outer Minkowski content by the perimeter and obtain the following results.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let $(X,\mathsf{d},\mathfrak{m})$ be an essentially non-branching $\mathsf{CD}_{loc}(K,N)$-space for some $K\in\mathbb{R}, N\in[1,\infty)$, with $\mathfrak{m}(X) = 1$ and having diameter $D\in(0,+\infty]$. Then*

$$h_{(X,\mathsf{d},\mathfrak{m})}\geq h_{K,N,D}. \tag{4.4}$$

*Moreover, for $K > 0$ the following holds: for every $N > 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\bar\delta = \bar\delta(K, N, \varepsilon)$ such that, for every $\delta \in [0, \bar\delta]$, if $(X, \mathsf{d}, \mathfrak{m})$ is an essentially non-branching $\mathsf{CD}_{loc}(K-\delta, N+\delta)$-space such that*

$$h_{(X,\mathsf{d},\mathfrak{m})} \le h_{K,N,\pi\sqrt{(N-1)/K}} + \delta \quad (= h(S^N(\sqrt{(N-1)/K})) + \delta \text{ if } N \in \mathbb{N}), \tag{4.5}$$

*then* $\operatorname{diam}(X) \ge \pi\sqrt{(N-1)/K} - \varepsilon$.

Before stating the last result let us observe that if $(X, \mathsf{d}, \mathfrak{m})$ is an $\mathsf{RCD}^*(K, N)$ space for some $K > 0$ then, called $\mathsf{d}' := \sqrt{\frac{K}{N-1}}\,\mathsf{d}$, we have that $(X, \mathsf{d}', \mathfrak{m})$ is $\mathsf{RCD}^*(N-1, N)$; in other words, if the Ricci lower bound is $K > 0$ then up to scaling we can assume it is actually equal to $N - 1$.

**Corollary 4.2.** *For every $N \in [2, \infty)$, $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\bar\delta = \bar\delta(N, \varepsilon) > 0$ such that the following hold. For every $\delta \in [0, \bar\delta]$, if $(X, \mathsf{d}, \mathfrak{m})$ is an $\mathsf{RCD}^*(N-1-\delta, N+\delta)$-space with $\mathfrak{m}(X) = 1$, satisfying*

$$h_{(X,\mathsf{d},\mathfrak{m})} \le h_{N-1,N,\pi} + \delta \quad (= h(S^N) + \delta \text{ if } N \in \mathbb{N}),$$

*then there exists an $\mathsf{RCD}^*(N-2, N-1)$ space $(Y, \mathsf{d}_Y, \mathfrak{m}_Y)$ with $\mathfrak{m}_Y(Y) = 1$ such that*

$$\mathsf{d}_{mGH}(X, [0,\pi] \times_{\sin}^{N-1} Y) \le \varepsilon.$$

*In particular, if $(X, \mathsf{d}, \mathfrak{m})$ is an $\mathsf{RCD}^*(N-1, N)$-space satisfying $h_{(X,\mathsf{d},\mathfrak{m})} = h_{N-1,N,\pi} (= h(S^N)$ if $N \in \mathbb{N})$, then it is isomorphic to a spherical suspension; i.e. there exists an $\mathsf{RCD}^*(N-2, N-1)$ space $(Y, \mathsf{d}_Y, \mathfrak{m}_Y)$ with $\mathfrak{m}_Y(Y) = 1$ such that $(X, \mathsf{d}, \mathfrak{m})$ is isomorphic to $[0,\pi] \times_{\sin}^{N-1} Y$.*

## References


[1] L. Ambrosio, Some fine properties of sets of finite perimeter in Ahlfors regular metric measure spaces, *Adv. Math.*, 159 (2001), 5167.

[2] L. Ambrosio, Fine properties of sets of finite perimeter in doubling metric measure spaces, *Set-Valued Anal.*, 10 (2002), 111–128.

[3] L. Ambrosio, N. Fusco and D. Pallara, Functions of Bounded Variation and Free Discontinuity Problems, *Oxford Mathematical Monographs*, (2000).

[4] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli and S. Di Marino, Perimeter as relaxed Minkowski content in metric measure spaces, *preprint ArXiv:*1603.08412, (2016).

[5] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, A. Mondino, and T. Rajala, Riemannian Ricci curvature lower bounds in metric measure spaces with $\sigma$-finite measure, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.,* **367**, 7, (2015), 4661–4701.

[6] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli and G. Savaré, Calculus and heat flow in metric measure spaces and applications to spaces with Ricci bounds from below, *Invent. Math.,* **195**, 2, (2014), 289–391.

[7] ———, Metric measure spaces with Riemannian Ricci curvature bounded from below, *Duke Math. J.*, **163**, (2014), 1405–1490.

[8] L. Ambrosio, A. Mondino and G. Savaré, Nonlinear diffusion equations and curvature conditions in metric measure spaces, *Preprint arXiv:*1509.07273, (2015).

[9] K. Bacher and K.-T. Sturm, Localization and tensorization properties of the curvature-dimension condition for metric measure spaces, *J. Funct. Anal.,* **259** (2010), 28–56.

[10] S. Bianchini and F. Cavalletti, The Monge problem for distance cost in geodesic spaces. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 318, 615 – 673 (2013).

[11] Y.D. Burago and V.A Zalgaller, Geometric inequalities, *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*, **285**. Springer, Berlin (1988).

[12] F. Cavalletti, Monge problem in metric measure spaces with Riemannian curvature-dimension condition, *Nonlinear Anal.* **99** (2014), 136–151.

[13] ———, Decomposition of geodesics in the Wasserstein space and the globalization property. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, **24** (2014) 493 – 551.

[14] F. Cavalletti and A. Mondino, Sharp and rigid isoperimetric inequalities in metric-measure spaces with lower Ricci curvature bounds. *Preprint Arxiv:*1502.06465, (2015), to appear in Inventiones Math.

[15] ———, Sharp and rigid geometric and functional inequalities in metric-measure spaces with lower Ricci curvature bounds. *Preprint Arxiv:* 1502.06465, (2015), to appear in Geometry & Topology.

[16] ———, Optimal maps in essentially non-branching spaces *Preprint arXiv:* 1609.00782, (2016), to appear in Comm. Cont. Math.

[17] F. Cavalletti and K.-T. Sturm. Local curvature-dimension condition implies measure-contraction property. *J. Funct. Anal.*, **262**, 5110 – 5127, 2012.

[18] M Erbar, Kuwada and K.T. Sturm, On the Equivalence of the Entropic Curvature-Dimension Condition and Bochner's Inequality on Metric Measure Space, *Invent. Math.*, **201**, 3, (2015), 993–1071.

[19] D. H. Fremlin, *Measure Theory*, volume 4. Torres Fremlin, (2002).

[20] N. Gigli, A. Mondino and G. Savaré, Convergence of pointed non-compact metric measure spaces and stability of Ricci curvature bounds and heat flows, *Proc. London Math. Soc.,* **111**, (5), (2015), 1071–1129.

[21] M. Gromov, Metric structures for Riemannian and non Riemannian spaces, *Modern Birkhäuser Classics*, (2007).
[22] M. Gromov and V. Milman, Generalization of the spherical isoperimetric inequality to uniformly convex Banach spaces. *Compositio Math.*, **62**, 3, (1987), 263–282.
[23] S. Honda, Cheeger constant, $p$-Laplacian, and Gromov-Hausdorff convergence, *Preprint Arxiv: 1310.0304v3*, (2014).
[24] C. Ketterer, Cones over metric measure spaces and the maximal diameter theorem. J. Math. Pures Appl. **103**, 5, (2015), 1228–1275.
[25] B. Klartag, Needle decomposition in Riemannian geometry, *preprint arXiv:*1408.6322, (2014), to appear in Memoirs AMS.
[26] J. Lott and C. Villani, Ricci curvature for metric-measure spaces via optimal transport, *Ann. of Math.* (2) **169** (2009), 903–991.
[27] F. Maggi, Sets of Finite Perimeter and Geometric Variational Problems (an Introduction to Geometric Measure Theory), *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*, (2012).
[28] E. Milman, Sharp Isoperimetric Inequalities and Model Spaces for Curvature-Dimension-Diameter Condition, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, **17**, (5), (2015), 1041–1078.
[29] M. Miranda jr., Functions of bounded variation on good metric spaces, *J Math. Pures Appl.*, **82**, 975–1004, (2003).
[30] A. Mondino and A. Naber, Structure Theory of Metric-Measure Spaces with Lower Ricci Curvature Bounds I, *preprint*, arXiv:1405.2222.
[31] F. Morgan, Geometric Measure Theory (A Beginner's Guide), *Elsevier/Academic Press,* Amsterdam, Fourth edition, (2009).
[32] A. Petrunin, Harmonic functions on Alexandrov spaces and their applications, *Electronic Res. Announc. AMS*, **9**, (2003), 135—141.
[33] ———, Alexandrov meets Lott-Sturm-Villani, *Münster J. Math.*, **4**, (2011), 53–64.
[34] T. Rajala and K.T. Sturm, Non-branching geodesics and optimal maps in strong $\mathsf{CD}(K,\infty)$-spaces, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations,* **50**, (2014), 831–846.
[35] K.T. Sturm, On the geometry of metric measure spaces. I, *Acta Math.* **196** (2006), 65–131.
[36] K.T. Sturm, On the geometry of metric measure spaces. II, *Acta Math.* **196** (2006), 133–177.
[37] C. Villani, Optimal transport. Old and new, *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften*, **338**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (2009).

Dipartimento di Matematica, Universitá degli Studi di Pavia, Italy
*E-mail address*: fabio.cavalletti@unipv.it

Mathematics Institute, The University of Warwick, United Kingdom
*E-mail address*: A.Mondino@warwick.ac.uk